

# Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director of Training

DATE: 24 May 1957

FROM : C/Junior Officer Training Program/TR

SUBJECT: Comments on the Junior Officer Training Program by [ ]  
in her Memorandum for the Record dated 16 May 1957.

STAT 1. If [ ] sweeping statements are accurate, another careful investigation of the Program should be made by some high level disinterested authority. She is, I think, trying to be constructive but I also feel strongly that she is misinformed, exaggerates her statements and is inaccurate in a number of them.

STAT 2. [ ] is without question a very able young woman academically. Like all the rest of us she has her faults, with some of which we are very familiar. I think she holds strong personal likes and dislikes and that I have been in the latter class ever since I reprimanded her at our first meeting while I was administering the A & E tests which she took [ ]. My sketchy notes written at that time include the phrase "must be awfully good to consider further". Her test results were very high and we took her. We have not done a good job with her case and we have always found difficulty in handling it. This I feel is our fault.

3. I call to your attention that the covering statement concerning the memorandum for the record which she attached to the copy sent to the Director of Personnel was not included in the material you gave me.

4. With respect to her various sweeping statements, I have the following comments to make which I shall be glad to explain in detail if it is desired:

(a) She is not up to date or accurate concerning the briefing of candidates.

(b) At the beginning of each of her on-the-desk training assignments, she knew and approved the program and she later indicated satisfaction with them. It was at our initiative that she was changed from the [ ] to the [ ] because the former did not keep her busy.

Document No. \_\_\_\_\_

NO CHANGE in Class. [ ]

[ ] DECLASSIFIED

Class. CHANGED TO: TS S C

DDA Form 4

Auth: DDA Form 471

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

- (c) We avoid a paternalistic attitude toward the JOT's. Most of them are somewhat older than [ ] and I am sure would resent our hovering over them. We try to get them in the scheme of the office of their assignment as soon as possible. But we check personally with them and with their supervisors on their progress and indeed, as in the case with [ ], change them when it is unsatisfactory.
- (d) While it is true that we have been extremely busy with candidates, no JOT to the best of my knowledge has been neglected, nor have we been inaccessible to them. It is our practice, when a candidate and a JOT is waiting to see us, to give preference to the JOT.
- (e) Her last sentence on page one going into page two is so completely inaccurate that it destroys the validity of her whole argument. In addition to her behavior during the testing period, her attitudes toward my briefing of her on the Program, her psychiatric hold, her outstanding academic skills, her delay in EOD and many other items, we can give the report of the long conversation with [ ] Instructor in charge of the OFC where her performance fell off so markedly.
- (f) She does not understand the purpose of the meetings with the University Consultants.
- (g) She is ignorant of our attempts to develop administrative officers.

5. Her suggestion of a "personal counseling system" is obvious though well-meant. It is impracticable because of slot limitations and furthermore would, if carried to the extremes she suggests, deny our concept that the JOT's are "big boys" who are able to stand on their own feet. We know our people pretty well. All one has to do is to observe the friendly personal contacts that take place between officer and JOT daily in this office. We find that the JOT who is interested in his career does not hesitate to approach us on any subject.

6. There must be some dissatisfactions among the JOT's. We welcome expression of them. We cannot know what goes on behind our backs but no JOT need hesitate to discuss his official or indeed personal problems with us at any time and without fear that to do so in any way would interfere with his fair treatment.

7. I would like careful investigation of her statement that "many Junior Officer Trainees...are dissatisfied...".

8. With regard to her conclusion, JOT candidates are told precisely that since we have no reliable unclassified measures to pre-determine the nature of the work they will follow, we wait until they are on board before making this decision, expose them during the initial training period to the various types of activity in the Agency, give them a chance to try out their aptitudes and abilities in actual on-the-job experience before final placement, and that the cooperation of the JOT in the determination of the field in which he should work is sought throughout the individual's tenure in the Program. The facts that the JOT has an opportunity to try out a job before he is permanently placed and to be given training appropriate to that placement are, I think, the elements of the Program most appreciated by him.

STAT To adopt a paternalistic "counseling system" is anti-  
thetical to the philosophy of the JOT Program as I see it.  
The present approach to the placement of JOT's is exactly  
what [ ] recommends in her last paragraph.

9. It is interesting to note that on 17 May 1957, the day after she wrote her memorandum, [ ] who "question(s) the value of continually bringing new Trainees into the Agency" came to the office and presented me with the vita of a man she recommended as a candidate for the Program!